

Remarks

Claims 1-22, 24-30, 32-38 and 40-68 are pending in this application, with claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21, 25, 29, 33, 37, 41, 45, 49, 53, 57, 61 and 65 being independent. Claims 23, 31 and 39 have been canceled and claims 1, 5, and 65 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the Examiner's allowance of claims 9-22, 24-30, 32-38 and 40-64, and the Examiner's indication that claims 3, 7 and 67 are directed to allowable subject matter.

Claims 1 and 5 have been rejected as being anticipated by Yamazaki '506. As amended, each of claims 1 and 5 recites that, in addition to the capacitor storage with its connection wiring line, its capacitance wiring line, and its insulating film, a pixel electrode is located over the interlayer insulating film. In view of this amendment, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection because Yamazaki '506 describes a capacitor 319 that employs a pixel electrode 318 as the connection wiring line and, accordingly, does not describe or suggest forming both the capacitor storage and a pixel electrode over the interlayer insulating film in the manner recited in claims 1 and 5.

Claims 1 and 5 and their dependent claims 4 and 8 have been rejected as being anticipated by Okita. Like Yamazaki '506, Okita describes a capacitor storage that uses a pixel electrode 16 as its connection wiring line. Accordingly, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection for the reasons noted above.

Claim 65 and its dependent claim 68 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Murade in view of Okita. Claim 65 has been amended to recite that the capacitance wiring line is formed on a same interlayer insulating film on which a pixel electrode is formed, such as is recited in allowed claim 9. Neither Murade, Okita, nor any combination of the two describes or suggests such an arrangement. Accordingly, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection for at least this reason.

Claims 2 and 6 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Okita in view of Suzawa. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Suzawa does not

Applicant : Yamazaki, et al.
Serial No. : 10/050,597
Filed : January 15, 2002
Page : 22 of 22

Attorney's Docket No.: 07977-290001 / US5432

remedy the failure of Okita to describe or suggest the subject matter of independent claims 1 and 5.

Claim 66 has been rejected as being unpatentable over Murade in view of Okita and Suzawa. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Suzawa does not remedy the failure of Murade and Okita to describe or suggest the subject matter of independent claim 65.

For the reasons provided above, applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

Enclosed is a \$770 check for the Request for Continued Examination fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2/25/04



John F. Hayden
Reg. No. 37,640

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331